

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated March 22, 2007.

Restriction

Claims 8-11 are hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his detailed analysis of the Applicant's arguments filed on this case.

However, the Applicant contests the Examiner's analysis of Dymetman insofar as the Examiner alleges that Dymetman teaches the claimed step of:

(e) generating, in a printer, first dot data for coded data using said page identity, said coded data identifying said page identity and a plurality of positions on said publication

Dymetman teaches that coded data identifying *page-id* and *pointer-loc* is printed onto a sheet. However, Dymetman does not specify how the *pointer-loc* information is generated. Presumably, Dymetman conceived that all the coded data comprising *page-id* and *pointer-loc* information is predetermined before printing. This predetermined coded data is then sent to a printer for printing, thereby generating one of Dymetman's coded 'blanks'.

By contrast, the present invention requires the coded data to be generated in the printer using the page identity. Hence, the coded data is not predetermined and sent to the printer for printing. Rather, the coded data is generated in the printer from the page identity. Hence, the printer generates coded data identifying a plurality of positions; this information is not predetermined and received by the printer. Neither Dymetman nor Ur teaches generating, in a printer, coded data identifying a plurality of positions from a page identity. Accordingly, the Applicant maintains that the combination of Dymetman and Ur fails to teach all limitations of the present invention, as claimed.

The Applicant also contests the Examiner's analysis of Dymetman insofar as the Examiner alleges that Dymetman teaches the claimed step of:

(d) associating said page identity with said description of said input element
(wherein the input element, as defined in step (c), includes a description of a zone of the input element on the page)

It is implicit in the teaching of Dymetman that, in order for his system to function, the page identity has to be associated with a description of each input element on a page. However, Dymetman fails to teach when or how this step is performed. Given how Dymetman envisages printing his *Intelligent Paper*, it must be fairly assumed that Dymetman makes this association after all the printing steps have been performed. By contrast, the present invention makes this association in step (d), before any printing steps have been performed. This is a key difference between the present invention and Dymetman, because it allows fully interactive pages to be printed on demand. By contrast, Dymetman would require a manual post-printing association to be performed, which means his interactive pages cannot

be made available on demand. Moreover, even if the Dymetman were to adopt the teaching of Ur, there is nothing in Ur teaching the skilled person to make an association between a zone of an input element and a page identity prior to printing.

In summary, the Applicant maintains that the combined teaching of the prior art would still not have led the skilled person to arrive at the present invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection of obviousness.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



Kia Silverbrook



Paul Lapstun

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762